DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 050 654 HE 002 058

AUTHOR	Kerr, Clark
TITLE	Should Everyone Be Able to Go to College?
INSTITUTION	Hawaii Univ., Honolulu.
PUB DATE	Jan 70
NOTE	11p.; Address presented at the First Interim Session, University of Hawaii, January, 1970
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Equal Education, *Higher Education, *Open Admissions, *Problems, *Universal Education

ABSTRACT

The question "should everybody be able to go to college," is one of the most important and explosive questions before higher education. This paper: (1) sketches several approaches to admittance - including the guild approach of Oxford and Cambridge, admittance based on manpower requirements - as in the U.S.S.R., the selective access approach, universal access, and universal attendance; (2) discusses why the universal access approach is currently chosen in the United States; (3) reviews some of the implications of universal access, such as vast numbers of new students, rising costs, and the need for coordination by public agencies; and (4) examines the positive and undesirable consequences of universal access. Some advantages are: expansion of educational opportunity and a contribution to the quality of the economy and to peoples' lives. Some negative aspects are: (1) a continuing battle over money; (2) loss of autonomy for the individual campus; (3) the probable movement toward meritocracy; (4) an increasing danger of collision between higher education and the surrounding community; (5) increasing pressure for universal attendance; (6) a surplus of highly educated people; (7) an increase in the number of people who are in "the period of youth," a time when they are no longer part of their original family, and yet without a family of their own; and (8) the tendencies of campuses to grow disproportionately larger. (AF)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED050654

Should Everyone Be Able to Go to College?

Clark Kerr
Former President, University of California, Berkeley
Chairman and Executive Director, Carnegie Commission on Higher Education

HE 002058

My topic today — "Should Everyone Be Able to Go to College?" — may or may not be, as it was billed, the most "expensive" question before higher education but it is perhaps the most explosive question. We are, at least, talking about one of the most important questions before higher education — really one of the most important questions before modern American society. I should like, first of all, to sketch in alternative approaches to admissions; second, to say which of these approaches I think is now being chosen in the United States, and why; and then, third, to indicate what I consider to be the good and bad consequences of some changes now being undertaken. At the end of my remarks I am going to suggest that, however desirable and even necessary the new developments are, they also open up a Pandora's box of new problems. I would hope that some of our attention could be focused on solutions to the problems which will soon be upon us as we adopt new policies.

So I will really present to you a puzzle which is going to be a challenge for all of us in higher education for quite some time: how can we get good results and maximize the good results while minimizing the bad ones. I think this *can* be done. I would agree with President Cleveland that for anybody engaged in higher education a sense of optimism is a necessary possession in approaching the problems.

APPROACHES TO ADMITTANCE

One approach to admissions is the older approach of Oxford and Cambridge or the private colleges and universities in the United States. This is the *guild approach*, where the people who are already in the system decide whom they want to take in and how many they want to take in. To some extent, this is still the practice in the medical profession in the United States, where there is fairly strict restriction of entrance to the trade.

The second approach is to do what has been done in Russia in fact, in France in theory, and in developing nations somewhere in between these two. This method bases admittance on *manpower requirements* (how many

engineers of what type are necessary, how many people are necessary in public health, etc.), and then trains people for those various specific jobs.

The third approach is to have what might be called *selective access*. This was the approach basically of the land grant university in the United States after the Civil War, where the institution had published rules which did not allow everybody to get in, but did admit a good many people.

A fourth alternative is to move toward *universal access*, to turn our backs on the guild or the manpower approach or selective access, and say that anyone who has graduated from high school or who has reached the age of, perhaps, 18 shall have a place available for him in higher education.

Then fifth, and beyond even universal access, is a possible policy of *universal attendance*. Potentially this policy could be achieved by law but that is unlikely. But it could come about through many pressures in modern society.

UNIVERSAL ACCESS: THE COMING CHOICE

The choice which is being made currently in the United States is the choice of universal access — that every high school graduate and everyone reaching a certain age can find a place in some institution of higher education somewhere. This happened first of all in the state of California in the master plan of 1960. For the first time any place in the world, California guaranteed that every high school graduate and any person over the age of 18 had a place available in higher education. That system has now gone on for ten years. It is currently in some jeopardy because of an unwillingness of the present administration of the state of California to finance it fully. But ten years ago this step was taken.

Currently it is promised to be taken in the fall of 1970 by the City University of New York. The governor of New York, Nelson Rockefeller, has recently said that he will at the next session of the legislature propose universal access as the policy of the state of New York. It is now the policy, but not the practice, in Washington, D.C. When Federal City College was established, it was promised that the college would be expanded sufficiently so that every high school graduate or person past 18 would find a place within it. It is being promised partially in the state of New Jersey where Rutgers has pledged to make places available regardless of academic standing at its campuses in Camden and Jersey City.

I would gather from the excellent *Prospectus* for 1970 of President Cleveland that the policy of universal access is accepted practice, if not yet law, in the state of Hawaii. I would expect by the year 2000 that this will be the practice in all fifty states.

I also think that such a practice is coming gradually around the world.

Japan and Russia are among the major nations moving in this direction. They are about half as far along as the United States. Major progress is being made in this direction also in Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Israel, and the Netherlands. So I think we are talking about not just a national trend but a world-wide trend.

The trend is coming for these reasons. First of all, there is an emphasis upon equality of opportunity not only in our nation but in all modern industrial nations as we push aristocracy and the feudal class system farther behind us. Also it is coming about because of the demands of a new technology, one that asks all the time for more and more skilled people. It is coming about, additionally, because of affluence: individuals in society can afford it.

IMPLICATIONS OF UNIVERSAL ACCESS

What then are some of the implications of this new policy? Initially, it means vast new numbers of students. The Carnegie Commission is estimating, for the United States, that by the year 2000 there will be 16 million "full-time equivalent" students in American colleges and universities as compared with something under 7 million at the present time. We are estimating that, by the year 2000, 90 per cent of the high school age group will graduate from high school as compared with 80 per cent at the present time; and, by the year 2000, for the nation as a whole, the same percentage of high school graduates will go on to higher education, as now do in the state of California — meaning 80 percent of men and 70 per cent of women, or an average of 75 per cent. If you take 75 per cent of 90 per cent, you find then in the year 2000 that two out of every three people of the age group will be entering into some form of higher education. We arrive at a total of 16 million students or thereabout.

A second implication is rising cost. Ten years ago, in 1959, we were spending 1 per cent of our gross national product on institutions of higher education. The proportion has now risen to 2 per cent and we estimate that it will need to go up to 3 per cent by 1980, falling off slightly in the 1980s because of the population situation. In the 1980s, given the past birth rates, there may be some years in which the absolute number of students actually goes down, to rise again in the 1990s. But by the year 2000 again we will be up to 3 per cent. That is a very substantial proportion of the gross national product to be spent upon higher education alone.

Another consequence of the policy of universal access is that we will have to have coordination by public agencies. The states are the institutions which will promise access, so there has to be some method for overall planning and overall guarantee that the plans will be fulfilled. The state will

increasingly plan for all of higher education, including private institutions. In the state of California, when we gave our guarantee of universal access, we set up a Coordinating Council with authority not only over the University of California and the state colleges and junior colleges, but likewise, and to a lesser extent, over the private colleges as well. So once the guarantee of access is given we will see increasing influence by the political authority of the state. Public agencies will become interested not only in guaranteeing places in colleges and universities but also minimizing the cost.

A fourth implication involves the need for more types of institutions or more differentiated elements within them to accommodate the great variety of students that come along with universal access. One of the great issues becomes, "How many levels should you have?" In California we decided upon three: the junior college level, the state college level, the university level. It could be two, it could be four or five, or almost any small number other than one. If we wish to have different levels of training for students of somewhat different abilities and interests, are we going to do this by setting up separate systems as in California, separate institutions within the same system as here in Hawaii, or by setting up separate programs and tracks within the same institution, as is being done by Toledo University in Ohio? We can certainly count on major battles over which is the best way to structure the training levels.

THE POSITIVE CONSEQUENCES

Up to now I have only covered the broadest implications. Before I go on to other consequences, most of which initially at least will appear to be unfortunate, let me say that the development of universal access is very desirable in a modern industrial society, and particularly one which is run on a democratic basis. It is the only way we can guarantee equality of opportunity. The great promise of the United States, from our very founding, has been that all men were created free and equal. That means they should have equal opportunity in the modern world — which in turn means equal opportunity to get an education.

But we don't have such equality of opportunity today in the United States. If we look at economic status, we find that 48 per cent of the students across the nation come from the top income quartile and only 7 per cent from the bottom income quartile. That does not add up to equality of opportunity. We find, in terms of race, that the chance of a young black person getting into college is only one-half as great as that of his white counterpart, and his chance of getting into medical school only one-eighth as great. And that is not equality of opportunity. If you look at opportunity by location, the

chance of a young person in the South going on to college is only half as great as in the Pacific southwest: California, New Mexico, Arizona. So if we want equality of opportunity, we will have to move toward universal access. The basic promise we have made to our people, and must fulfill, is equality of opportunity.

Well-distributed educational opportunity is desirable for another reason — for its contribution to economic growth. All the studies which have been made show that individuals with more education earn more money, which means, to the extent that the market is effective in determining people's values, that there is an additional contribution to society. If we look at it another way, and try to explain growth and income as far as we can by the number of man hours worked plus the amount of capital invested, we still end up with a "residual" which can only be explained as an outcome of the increased skill of the people. From the most recent study on the United States by Edward Dennison of the Brookings Institution, we learn that in recent years half of the increased growth per capita in the United States is due to technology — better technology based largely upon higher education — and to the greater skill of our people. Adam Smith, in his famous book, *The Wealth of Nations*, said the wealth of a nation is the total product of its labor. He went on to explain how, among other things, the skill of the people added to the nation's wealth. In a modern society, the wealth of a nation is strongly based on the education of its people.

Third, beyond these two factors, is the contribution education makes to the quality of people's lives — the chance to understand themselves better, to understand society better, to open up new interests in music, art, politics and so forth. So I think for the sake of equality of opportunity, for the sake of economic growth, for the sake of quality of life, it is highly desirable that we take the very great step toward universal access.

UNDESIRABLE CONSEQUENCES

The desirable consequences are to some extent balanced by undesirable ones. I shall list eight of the latter as part of what could be a longer list. One undesirable consequence is that we are going to have a *continuing battle over money* — how to get additional millions and billions of dollars. The Carnegie Commission has estimated that, as compared with the $20 billion spent in 1968-69 by institutions of higher education in the United States, to move ahead but not yet accomplish universal access, the bill to the nation in 1976, not ten years later, will be more like $40 billion. This means an extra $20 billion in less than a decade; in other words, by 1976 our investment will be doubled. A tremendous battle will go on over where to get that money. How

much should be put in by the federal government, how much by the states, how much by private individuals through contributions and tuition?

I might note, incidentally, that the battle at the state level seems to be in the process of being won in the state of Hawaii. In fact the record here is the most remarkable among all the fifty states. Our Commission has been developing a rather complicated index of the effort made by the several states toward higher education. We have put into it a percentage of per capita income spent on higher education and a percentage of the state budget going to higher education, among other factors. What we find for Hawaii is this: in 1953, it was the unit (it was, of course, not yet a state) making the least effort. It was the last among fifty states and territories. By 1963, it had moved up to position number 33. By 1966, the last year in which we have the full figures for all of the fifty states, it had moved up to 19, and the presumption is that it is higher than that in 1970. Some other indices taken by themselves will show even a higher level for Hawaii. All in all this has been a perfectly amazing rise.

Now a second undesirable consequence of universal access is the *loss of autonomy for the individual campus*. Such a loss is inevitable because promising universal access means we must have overall plans made at a level higher than the campus itself. The plans have to be made far ahead of time — before any of the current students are on campus and before many of the faculty are there. Aside from the need for advance planning at the highest levels, as we move toward universal access, the public will become much more interested in higher education than when the college campus was an ivory tower on the periphery of society. Now the university is becoming so central that it is everybody's business.

Also, as we approach universal access, we are going to have a good many battles among institutions — political battles — as to what their respective roles should be. Each institution is likely to want to have the same role as Harvard. Do the community colleges remain two-year institutions or do they become four-year campuses or do they become full universities? If they are to become full universities, shall they have the full research component of a great national research university?

The loss of autonomy for the campus has many implications, particularly at a time when faculty members are asking for more authority, and students are asking for a stronger position within the governance of the institution. The very guarantee of universal access means that more power is being distributed *outside* the campus while the battles within the campus are over a smaller total amount of power.

With the third undesirable consequence, we start to get into a major battle affecting society as a whole. One of the great coming problems concerns the position of the meritocracy and access to it. We see battles over this issue

going on very intensively in Japan. It makes so much difference there what primary school you go to and what subsequent schools you get into; and the grades you make in the examinations then determine what university you go to. The university a student attends, in turn, determines where he ends up in the civil service, what job he gets in corporate life or in the professions, and affects his life ever after. In France, part of the trouble of May 1968 was due exactly to these pressures. Students wanted to have a guaranteed place in the meritocracy of the medical profession or a guaranteed place in the meritocracy of the civil service, and there were just too many students being educated to fill the positions.

So we have, as we move toward a meritocracy of ability, a growing competition on the campus and for status among campuses — the merit a person shows in college and the standing of his college determine so much of the rest of his life. As a result, battles develop over admission policy, over remedial work, over grading. But beyond that, in subsequent life, people, whose "merit" has been recognized, generally like the positions they get in a meritocracy — they are paid more, they have more power. But what about the people who fail? More people will fail in competition than succeed. I see a coming conflict, that exists to some extent already, between the idea of a democracy, where every man's opinion is equal to that of everybody else, and the new meritocracy, where the experts have the prestige, and the power, and the money, and somehow stand above the common man.

In the state of California, when I went around that state a great deal as a campus chancellor and then as a university president, I began getting questions from audiences all over the state having to do with this issue of the rise of the meritocracy — what it meant to them, what it meant to their children, what it meant to society.

The fourth negative consequence is what David Reisman has called the collision course between higher education and the surrounding community — a collision course made up of the things I have mentioned already, battles over money, over autonomy, over the meritocracy. But it is also a collision course because higher education is tied in with the idea of change — not just scientific change, but social change as well. Many people are tired of change. Yet we make our institutions of higher education more and more important in society and more involved in change. Likewise, the institutions of higher education — no longer the farms, no longer the factories — become the main centers for social dissent along with the ghettos in the United States. And so the process of introducing universal access to higher education aggravates the collision course between the campus and the community.

Fifth in this list of negative implications is that we may move beyond universal access to universal attendance. I think this would be quite unwise, but it might be the next step beyond universal access. There is a pressure

from parents for young people to attend college. When 2 per cent attended there was not all that much pressure for everybody to go. When two out of three go, as we can foresee by the year 2000, I can hear every parent saying, "My child has to go." Employer pressure will also increase. Employers are now at a point where they hesitate to employ anybody unless he has a high school degree. When most people have a college degree, will employers hire someone without some kind of college degree? As more and more young people go to college there will be more and more pressure on the ones who do not choose to go.

The Bureau of Social Research at Columbia University recently completed a nationwide study. Among other things, the study tried to find out how many *involuntary* students we have already. The authors came to the conclusion that 15 per cent of our students, roughly one student in six, are on campus against their own will. They are there because of pressure from parents or because they expect a degree will have a favorable impact upon their job possibilities. So we are already living with a captive audience. If we go to universal attendance, I thing we would have even more of a captive audience and more trouble. I do not think that everybody really wants to go to college. I do not really think that everybody can gain enough from the years spent in higher education to make it worth his while. When we approach universal access, at some point we may pass the point of no return, and cross over to universal attendance. At that point, we will really have to face the unfortunate consequences of which I have just spoken.

Sixth, we also must face the negative implication of what happens to people after they have graduated. As more and more people have college degrees, more and more of them will have to take jobs which have not historically been filled by people with college degrees. In a recent census monograph, Folger and Ham say that already by 1975 there will be in the United States three to four million people with college degrees beyond the number that can be absorbed by the types of jobs that absorbed them in 1960. In 1970 we are facing already a very major surplus of Ph.D. degrees. The surplus is showing up in field after field. In the 1960s we exactly tripled our production of Ph.D.s while we only doubled the number of undergraduate students. Even as we were doubling the number of students, we increased the proportion of Ph.D.'s among the teachers. But now we may again triple the production of Ph.D.s in the 1970s over those produced in 1960. Yet, in the decade of the 1970s, the number of students to be taught will increase by only one-half. In the 1980s, in some years, the absolute number of students will probably go down. We have created an enormous capacity now to turn out Ph.D.s — more than we may need in the future. At other levels, the case may be not quite so dramatic, but the same development could occur throughout the job market.

When the college degree is not worth so much, I think some other things are going to happen. Income differentials will change. We will have a *comparative surplus of highly educated people* because in a sense we are educating everybody away from being a common laborer. In the future, our salary differentials may actually be stood on their heads, so that people who used to get the least money may not necessarily get the most compensation but they will get a great deal more. Those who previously got the most will be getting less. We can now see how the pay of coal miners, once a very low-paid group, keeps going up and up and up, and there are other illustrations. We may find eventually, when education is available for everybody, that people get paid not so much on the basis of their education — the pattern of the past — *but on the basis of the disagreeableness of the job.* Generally the more education required for it, the more agreeable the job. We are going to find the garbage collectors making more than the professors. The new Ph.D. who does not get a job is already unhappy about these prospects and some of you who will soon graduate from college may be also. But I really think that in the long run the new pay differentials will lead to somewhat greater social justice than we ever had before in history. So this consequence is not entirely negative.

An additional consequence of the increased supply of trained people is that *jobs are likely to change quite considerably.* Throughout history, education has been dependent pretty much upon the job. We trained people for the job, and the job was the primary consideration. I think this situation is going to be reversed. Increasingly we are going to find that the nature of the person and his training determine the job; and jobs are going to have to be made more interesting, people on them given more responsibility, the work situation made more open, the work group given more participation in making decisions. Employers will need to make adjustments to a labor force more highly educated than ever in history. There will be minor battles in office after office and plant after plant. But the result of this development will be a desirable one in the end.

As a seventh impact, we are likely to see an *increase in the number of people who are in what Keniston has called "the period of youth."* In early history there was no such period. In primitive societies and agricultural societies, a young man went from being in the family of his father to set up his own family on his own piece of land. As the society got richer, the aristocrats went to college and had their grand tour of Europe. But now we have millions and millions of people in a "period of youth" — no longer a part of their original family, not yet having established their own family, being in a dependent status in society without full control of their lives, living in an isolated environment that is somewhat out of contact with the total reality. Freud once wrote that through work people gain a sense of reality. I think

there is a good deal of truth to that statement. For the first time in history we have millions of people around the world — for longer and longer periods of time — in this situation of "youth." This condition has many implications for the establishment of new cultural patterns and new political attitudes. It also generates a kind of basic unrest — for youth are not really full citizens running their own lives, but instead are in the classroom listening to other people, having other people make regulations for them. And all this without knowing what their jobs are going to be and facing an intense competition to get into the meritocracy.

The eighth implication of universal access is that *campuses tend to grow and grow and grow*. I think that they tend to get much too big. In the proposal for the University of Hawaii's new campus, which I have been reading, there is mention of Berkeley having established some kind of a magic figure of 25,000 students. I was as much involved as anyone in arriving at that figure when I was chancellor on the Berkeley campus. We set it there because of the situation then. We had something like 23,000 students at the peak of the GI rush. The regents were talking about Berkeley and UCLA going to 50 or 60 or even 70,000 students, saying it was cheaper to do it that way. After all, Berkeley had a library and a stadium, and why duplicate them? I fought the battle to keep Berkeley smaller. Actually, the figure we settled on was 27,500 — and this became a kind of magic figure in the University of California.

I personally think that it is too big a figure. We never thought when we set the Berkeley figure we were going to set a pattern for the other campuses of the University of California, but in a way we did. We did historically what we had to do but I think it was a mistake to get that big. I was happy to see the suggestion in President Cleveland's *Prospectus* that the Manoa campus might be held at 23,000 students. I have some doubts as to whether that might not turn out to be too large — particularly as the proportion of graduate students grows. Proportionately larger graduate enrollments mean more and more faculty, bigger and bigger departments — even if the total number of students does not grow.

We have to be very much concerned about the impact of universal access on size. We too often let a campus grow and grow while maintaining the internal structure it always had. The bigger a campus becomes, the more it ought to be decentralized. We should not be neglecting the internal structure while growth occurs.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

So let me say, in conclusion, that I think the most important single development in higher education is the shift to universal access. I think that it

will be more important in terms of its long-range impact, for example, than student activism in the decade of the 1960s. Universal access to higher education is going to be one of the important factors affecting the future of society — to some extent bringing us into a new society. As I said, I think universal access is generally desirable. In any case, I think it is absolutely inevitable. But it brings with it many problems — almost a Pandora's box.

We faced some problems a little over a decade ago after Sputnik. It has been a triumph the way American higher education took hold of science. The United States is now the science capital of the whole world. Forty per cent of the Nobel prize winners are now in the United States; before World War I, it was more like 4 per cent. We increased the quality of science education, and vastly increased the quantity of science Ph.D.s and other highly trained people. We had the problem after Sputnik of adjusting to the new interest in science — we did it, but we did not look at the problems that came along with it. We did not look at the downgrading of the humanities and the social sciences. We did not look at the impact that it had on teaching, as research became the new Holy Grail. We did not look at the impact it had on the allegiance of the professor. He used to be tied basically to his own university campus, but the alma mater came to be his federal agency in Washington and the official he knew there was his president. He might change from campus to campus but he never changed his agency. Tragedy to him was not if his president was fired in his university, but if the man he knew at the agency was retired, or went some place else — that was a real tragedy for him. So we have seen the emergence of what Robert Merton and Alvin Gouldner and David Reisman have called the "cosmopolitans" and the "home guard." The latter take an interest in educational policy and the undergraduates. The former often do not. By emphasizing science so heavily (with science being financed by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of Defense), the university became an important part of the military-industrial complex — or the military-industrial-education complex, as it is called by some.

So we had a problem after Sputnik and that problem had a solution. But we did not pay enough attention to the problems that came from the solution. Again we have a problem — of moving toward universal access in higher education. We will find a solution to that. Universal access will become national policy. But this time around we should give some advance thought to the problems that will follow from the solution. So in the state of Hawaii, as you move from the practice of universal access to legislative acceptance of it as a matter of principle, I would suggest that here, as elsewhere throughout the United States, we ought to look at the problem and at the solution to it; but we also ought to be looking at the problems that come from the solution, and at the solutions to these further problems.